

Public Document Pack



Cambridge City Council

COMMUNITY SERVICES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

To: Scrutiny Committee Members: Ratcliffe (Chair), Sinnott (Vice-Chair), Abbott, Austin, Barnett, Bird, Gillespie and O'Connell

Alternates: Councillors Gawthrop, Nethsingha and Sargeant

Executive Councillors: Johnson (Executive Councillor for Communities) and Smith (Executive Councillor for Streets and Open Spaces)

Despatched: Monday, 19 June 2017

Date: Thursday, 29 June 2017

Time: 5.00 pm

Venue: Committee Room 1 & 2, The Guildhall, Market Square, Cambridge, CB2 3QJ

Contact: James Goddard

Direct Dial: 01223 457013

AGENDA – SECOND CIRCULATION

- 10 **Building Stronger Communities: Community Centres Strategy** (*Pages 3 - 28*)

- 11 **Review of Strategic Partnerships: Health and Wellbeing Board and Children's Executive Partnership** (*Pages 29 - 38*)

Intentionally blank page



To: Executive Councillor for Communities:
Councillor Richard Johnson

Report by: Head of Community Services, Debbie Kaye

Relevant scrutiny committee: Community Services Scrutiny Committee 29/6/17

Wards affected: Abbey: Arbury: Castle: Cherry Hinton: Coleridge:
East Chesterton: King's Hedges: Market: Newnham:
Petersfield: Queen Edith's: Romsey: Trumpington:
West Chesterton:

STRATEGIC REVIEW OF COMMUNITY PROVISION - BUILDING STRONGER COMMUNITIES: COMMUNITY CENTRES STRATEGY

Key decision

1. Executive summary

- 1.1 In October 2015, the Executive Councillor for Communities, Arts & Recreation made a decision to undertake a strategic review of community provision. A full review was undertaken, including: an audit of existing facilities provided by a wide range of organisations; mapping of access to facilities across the city and analysis of where the greatest needs for community support exist.
- 1.2 In January 2017, the Executive Councillor for Communities approved a draft community centres strategy for consultation with stakeholders and the wider community on the draft proposals. This strategy set out to deliver a programme of support with the overarching theme of 'Building Stronger Communities.'
- 1.3 This report considers the results of that consultation exercise. 72% of respondents were in support of the Council's vision, with strong support for recommendations to replace out-dated centres and to investigate community use. Proposals relating to six centres are recommended for adoption in the final version of the strategy.
- 1.4 Replacement of the Meadows with a new community hub was supported, but the redevelopment of Buchan Street for housing was not supported at this time. As these proposals are inter-linked, further exploration of options and engagement of the community to consider them is needed.

- 1.5 The report sets out actions to be carried out in pursuit of the strategy.
- 1.6 The Council will use the Building Stronger Communities Strategy and the data collected throughout this review, to inform future considerations for Section 106 / CIL funding.

2. Recommendations

The Executive Councillor is recommended to:

- 2.1 Adopt the proposals relating to six centres as set out in the draft strategy, as follows:
 - 2.1.1 **Ross Street Community Centre** – seek to lease the centre to a voluntary organisation, with an agreement to safeguard community use. If a suitable organisation cannot be found the Council will retain management of the centre. In order to deliver this proposal a delegation is proposed at 2.4.
 - 2.1.2 **Nun’s Way Pavilion** – explore options for a suitable alternative community space, keeping the centre operational in the meantime. Once alternative space is found options for leasing the pavilion to a voluntary organisation will be explored. If none are viable, then the pavilion could be used for sports use only.
 - 2.1.3 **37 Lawrence Way** - explore options for a suitable alternative community space, keeping the centre operational in the meantime. Once alternative community space is found the premises will be returned to Council housing stock.
 - 2.1.4 **82 Akeman Street** - replace the community space as part of the proposed new housing project in this location in consultation with the community.
 - 2.1.5 **Brownsfield Youth & Community Centre** - retain as a Council managed community centre, ensuring community access.
 - 2.1.6 **Trumpington Pavilion** - continue to work with Trumpington Resident’s Association towards greater sustainability and independence.
- 2.2 Modify the proposals set out in the draft strategy for two centres, as follows:
 - 2.2.1 **The Meadows Community Centre and Buchan Street Neighbourhood Centre** – approve the completion of a full feasibility study for both centres, to explore with local groups, partners and centre users whether it is possible to deliver the community hub at the Meadows and to

further explore options for Buchan Street. This feasibility work will need to consider:

- practical development constraints, planning issues and financial feasibility;
- detailed analysis of current uses of both centres and potential future partnership arrangements.

2.3 Adopt the proposals as originally outlined in relation to meeting identified needs where there are gaps in provision

2.3.1 **Abbey** - continue to support County Council led work on redevelopment of a new centre on the East Barnwell Community Centre site.

2.3.2 **Queen Edith's** - explore opportunities to work with existing facility providers in the north of the ward.

2.3.3 **East Chesterton** - explore opportunities in the north of the ward for new facility provision through growth.

2.3.4 **Cherry Hinton** - support the development of a community hub in Cherry Hinton Library with local partners, with the proviso that the County Council continue library services there and a sustainable management solution is found.

2.4 Delegate the authority to deliver the proposals as required.

2.4.1 **Ross Street:** Approve delegated authority to the Strategic Director following consultation with the Executive Councillor, Chair and Spokes to approve the selection process for a voluntary organisation to take on the management of Ross Street Community Centre (including community use requirements) and to approve the selection of a voluntary organisation in accordance with this process.

2.5 Report back to the Committee on progress with delivering the strategy, as described in the actions set out in Section 5.

3. Background

3.1 Community centres meet a wide range of community needs across the city, including providing spaces for a range of local groups and individuals to meet; facilities for children, young people and families, and for advice services and community development work. Whilst the Council owns a number of community centres, residents also benefit from buildings owned and/or managed by a range of organisations.

- 3.2 The Council currently owns eight community centres¹, of which:
- Five are managed directly (The Meadows, Buchan Street, Brown's Field, Ross Street, and 82 Akeman Street).
 - Three are managed by local groups (Trumpington Pavilion, 37 Lawrence Way and Nun's Way Pavilion).
- 3.3 Three new community centres are under development, two of which are expected to open in 2017-18:
- Clay Farm - new provision for the Southern Fringe growth area. The centre will be run as a joint enterprise with the County Council, providing a multi-agency community hub.
 - Storey's Field – new provision for the North West Cambridge growth area. The centre will be run jointly by the University of Cambridge and the Council via a joint venture, the Storey's Field Community Trust.
 - Darwin Green will be new facility provision for the NIAB North West Cambridge growth area. The building start date is not yet confirmed.
- 3.4 There are many other independent organisations providing a wide range of valuable community facilities across the city, some of which have been supported through Section 106 developer contributions to mitigate the impact of development. The Council has committed to publishing information about centres identified during the review to encourage wider community use.
- 3.5 The review brief was an evidenced-based, strategic assessment of community provision to achieve the following outcomes:
- Stronger communities (e.g. inclusive, connected, resilient, vibrant, good places to live).
 - Council resources are targeted to known need.
 - Savings - with a focus on reducing net cost by opportunity for further efficiency and generating increased income with the possibility of redirecting resources.
- 3.6 A comprehensive programme of work has been undertaken to date to enable the development of the draft Community Centres strategy. Key tasks are listed below and links to appropriate reports are available in Section 7 of this report:
- Community Facilities Audit, Mapping and Analysis
 - Expressions of interest in voluntary sector management of Council centres
 - Geographic, demographic and stakeholder risk assessment
 - Consideration of wider corporate priorities
 - Categorisation of core, transitional and independent centres

¹ Arbury Community Centre is owned by the Council and leased to Arbury Community Association, a local charity and so has not been included as a Council venue for the purpose of this review.

- Partnership discussions around joined-up services and co-location

4. Consultation

4.1 Following the approval of the draft strategy, a 12 week public consultation to enable feedback on the draft proposals ran from the 13th February to 5th May 2017 and consisted of:

- Online survey (344 received)
- Drop-ins (28.5 hours of face to face public engagement)
- Reports to all Area Committees (4)
- Focus group work with equality groups (voluntary sector led)
- Partner engagement
- Group meetings on request

4.2 The Vision

72% (159 responses) supported the overall vision the Council is seeking to achieve through the review, that:

- a.) Council supported community centres are located in the right areas of the city to address the greatest needs:
 - They are financially sustainable and provide accessible, joined up services to residents
 - They effectively contribute to the delivery of the Council's corporate priorities in a cost efficient way
- b.) The Council has successful partnership arrangements in place with the voluntary sector and other agencies that meet the needs of local communities
- c.) Council community development resource and activities are flexible to meet changing needs of the city

4.3 The Meadows & Buchan Street Community Centres

- 58% (130 responses) supported the proposal to build a new community hub on the Meadows site to include services currently offered by the Meadows and nearby Buchan Street and consider opportunities for housing
- 69% (135 responses) supported voluntary sector management of Buchan Street Neighbourhood centre
- 31% (60 responses) supported the development of the Buchan Street site for housing

Council Comment and Analysis of Consultation Feedback: The consultation indicates that there is support for the Council to develop a new hub to replace the Meadows Community Centre and consider housing on the site. It also showed support for retaining the Buchan Street building as an opportunity for the voluntary sector to deliver services. Detailed feasibility work is required to explore what it is possible to deliver.

4.4 **37 Lawrence Way & Nun's Way Pavilion**

- 79% (124 responses) supported voluntary sector management of Nun's Way Pavilion and finding suitable alternative community space
- 83% (135 responses) supported finding suitable alternative community space and returning 37 Lawrence Way to Council housing stock

Council Comment and Analysis of Consultation Feedback: The consultation supports the Council's aspiration to provide accessible community space in King's Hedges. Both facilities will remain operational until suitable alternative provision is found.

4.5 **Ross Street Community Centre**

- 68% (125 responses) supported voluntary sector management of Ross Street Community Centre

Council Comment and Analysis of Consultation Feedback: The consultation supports the Council's aspiration to lease the centre to a voluntary organisation in order to build the capacity and sustainability of the voluntary sector. A community use agreement will safeguard use for the local community.

4.6 **Brown's Field Community Centre**

- 96% (174 responses) supported the Council managing Brown's Field Youth and Community Centre

Council Comment and Analysis of Consultation Feedback: The consultation supports the Council's proposal to retain the management of this important and valued community centre serving East Chesterton.

4.7 **Gaps in provision identified**

- 87% (167 responses) supported the gaps in provision identified in Cherry Hinton, Abbey and areas of East Chesterton and Queen Edith's wards.

Council Comment and Analysis of Consultation Feedback: The consultation supported the need to address the gaps in provision identified by the review evidence base.

- #### 4.8 **Partners and stakeholders** – organisations have appreciated early engagement with the review proposals, and because of synergies with other reviews being completed post-election, the County Council want to continue close dialogue so that we maximise joint working opportunities particularly in relation to 'Community Hubs'; future provision of Library Services; public health services and wider community development activities.

- 4.9 **Equalities focus groups** – in general feedback was very supportive of the review proposals with some useful information collected to inform more detailed developments as the work progresses. Several expressions of interest have been received regarding the management of our centres from voluntary sector organisations.
- 4.10 Consultees raised a number of individual questions and concerns to which the Council has provided responses in Appendix A. The final proposals are also underpinned by the following key principles:
- a.) They will provide the Council with a clear corporate steer now and for the future
 - b.) They are supported by robust evidence to target resources at known need in the city
 - c.) They will support change from current provision to the future vision in a supportive way
 - d.) They have been developed in a way which will seek to avoid creating instability for the local community as changes are implemented

5. Proposed Next Steps

Subject to the approval of the recommendations in Section 2 of this report, the following work plan is proposed:

5.1 During 2017/18

5.1.1 Meadows & Buchan Street Community Centres – detailed feasibility work to be completed and reported back to the appropriate Scrutiny Committee.

5.1.2 Ross Street Community Centre – design and implement an asset transfer process to explore the leasing of the centre to a voluntary sector organisation.

5.1.3 Akeman Street – engage the community in the design and development process for the replacement of this community space.

5.1.4 Review Neighbourhood Community Projects and report back to committee in January 2018.

5.1.5 Trumpington Pavilion - work with Trumpington Residents' Association towards greater sustainability and complementary activity programming.

5.1.6 New community centres – implementation of Clay Farm, Storey's Field and Darwin Green.

5.1.7 Publish information about community spaces identified during the review with an initial list on Council's website by August 2017, followed by more detailed exploration of the best way to make this information accessible to promote use of citywide community facilities.

5.2 2018 – 2021

5.2.1 Nun's Way & Lawrence Way – explore suitable alternative community space and continue with current arrangements in the interim.

5.2.2 Further discussions regarding opportunities for the co-location of services and development of multiagency community hubs

5.2.3 Implement any proposals for change approved for The Meadows and Buchan Street

5.2.4 Continue to support the voluntary sector to build capacity to deliver their aspirations to take on the management of further community facilities in future

5.2.5 Gaps in provision – follow up work as identified, with timescales to be agreed for each separately

6. Implications

(a) Financial Implications

- Initial analysis indicates that reconfiguring community centre provision should release funding from facilities management and maintenance which could be reinvested in community work. More detail will emerge through the detailed feasibility studies.

(b) Staffing Implications

- The Council will continue to deliver community development services in accordance with the requirements of the Building Stronger Communities Strategy. Some proposals will affect staff, but are not planned to be implemented immediately. Full consultation will be undertaken with staff affected by any changes within corporate policy.

(c) Equality and Poverty Implications

- The Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) undertaken earlier in this project has been updated to reflect the consultation findings, and is attached as Appendix B. Key points include:
 - i) Alternative community space in King's Hedges to replace Nun's Way and Lawrence Way will improve accessibility

- ii) Loss of provision at Buchan Street would increase travel distance to the Meadows for some, but residents would remain within the 15 minute travel time used for assessing provision across the city
- iii) Local equalities groups will be consulted about the development of future provision
- iv) Inform S106 investment to improve accessibility and provision at other facilities

(d) **Environmental Implications**

- There are no implications at this stage, however as part of the detailed feasibility work, the potential for reducing energy usage and carbon emissions will be considered and will inform final recommendations.

(e) **Procurement**

- There are no procurement implications at this stage. Any future implications will be undertaken within corporate procedures.

(f) **Consultation and Communication**

- The consultation and communication plan will be updated following approval of the Community Centres Strategy.
- Further consultation will take place with the tenants of the retail units at Buchan Street, as options develop.

(g) **Community Safety**

- There are no implications at this stage.

7. Background papers

Previous reports to this committee have informed this report:

19th January 2017

<http://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CIId=176&MIId=3078&Ver=4>

30th June 2016

<http://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CIId=176&MIId=3076&Ver=4>

14th January 2016

<http://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CIId=176&MIId=2792&Ver=4>

8th October 2015

<http://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CIId=176&MIId=2791&Ver=4>

8. Appendices

- Appendix A – Consultation and Feasibility Findings and Analysis
- Appendix B – Equalities Impact Assessment

9. Inspection of papers

To inspect the background papers please follow the appropriate link or if you have a query on the report please contact:

Authors: Jackie Hanson
Community Funding & Development Manager
Allison Conder
Community Review Manager

Telephone Number: 01223 – 457867/457862

Email: jackie.hanson@cambridge.gov.uk
allison.conder@cambridge.gov.uk

Appendix A – Consultation and Initial Feasibility Headline Findings

Review Evidence	Draft Proposal	Headline Findings	Response	Final Proposal
<p>1. The Meadows Community Centre</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ King’s Hedges and Arbury are high priority areas for the Council’s services. ▪ The proposals seek to enhance provision, not reduce it. ▪ The Meadows and Buchan Street serve very similar areas, and the Council does not need to retain two centres in this location. ▪ There is an opportunity for the Council to improve provision to residents by co-locating services on one site. ▪ There are opportunities to provide a wider range of services with partners and Council housing. ▪ Tackling the city’s housing crisis and implementing the Local Plan are corporate priorities for the Council. 	<p>Build a new community centre (‘Hub’) on the site of the existing Meadows Community Centre, to include the services currently offered by The Meadows and nearby Buchan Street Neighbourhood Centre.</p> <p>Consider potential for a wider range of services and an opportunity for housing.</p>	<p>Consultation 58% of survey responses supported the draft proposal.</p> <p>Main comments/concerns:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reduction in provision 2. Cost/waste of money 3. Increased travel 4. Disruption during change 5. Extend rather than redevelop 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Priority space from Buchan Street would be reprovided. 2. Investment to ensure centres are well maintained. Strategic approach to realign resources to areas of highest need. 3. 15 minute walk time catchments identified, consider specific issues further. 4. Principle to avoid creating instability for local communities 5. Detailed feasibility work to be completed to look at the viability of the site In 2 above. 	<p>The Council is committed to providing good quality spaces for the community in Kings Hedges and acknowledges the outcomes of the consultation. This supported both the provision of a new community hub on the Meadows Community Centre, and exploring a voluntary organisation’s interest in leasing Buchan Street Neighbourhood Centre.</p> <p>In response to these findings the Council will complete a full feasibility study for both centres, to explore with local groups, partners and centre users whether it is possible to deliver the community hub at the Meadows and to further explore options for Buchan Street. This feasibility work will need to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ practical development constraints, planning issues and financial feasibility; ▪ detailed analysis of current uses of both centres and potential future partnership arrangements.

Review Evidence	Draft Proposal	Headline Findings	Response	Final Proposal
<p>2. Buchan Street Neighbourhood Centre</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> King’s Hedges and Arbury are high priority areas for the Council’s services. The proposals seek to enhance provision, not reduce it. Buchan Street and The Meadows serve very similar areas, and the Council does not need to retain two centres in this location. There are opportunities to provide a wider range of services with partners and Council housing. Tackling the city’s housing crisis and implementing the Local Plan are corporate priorities for the Council. 	<p><u>Proposal A</u> Explore voluntary sector interest in taking on the centre to deliver services from</p> <p><u>Proposal B</u> Explore the development of this site to provide additional housing</p>	<p>Consultation</p> <p>69.2% of survey responses were in favour of proposal A.</p> <p>30.8% of survey responses were in favour of proposal B.</p> <p>Main comments/concerns: 1. Reduction in provision 2. Against housing - 17 comments For housing - 42 comments 3. Cost/waste of money</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Priority space from Buchan Street would be reprovided. Providing Council housing is a priority for the Council. Investment to ensure well maintained. Strategic approach to realign resources to areas of highest need. 	<p>The Council is committed to providing good quality spaces for the community in Kings Hedges and acknowledges the outcomes of the consultation. This supported both the provision of a new community hub on the Meadows Community Centre, and exploring a voluntary organisation’s interest in leasing Buchan Street Neighbourhood Centre.</p> <p>In response to these findings the Council will complete a full feasibility study for both centres, to explore with local groups, partners and centre users whether it is possible to deliver the community hub at the Meadows and to further explore options for Buchan Street. This feasibility work will need to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> practical development constraints, planning issues and financial feasibility detailed analysis of current uses of both centres and potential future partnership arrangements.

Review Evidence	Draft Proposal	Headline Findings	Response	Final Proposal
<p>3. Nun's Way Pavilion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ King's Hedges and Arbury are high priority areas for the Council's services. ▪ The proposals seek to enhance provision, not reduce it. ▪ Nun's Way pavilion is a challenging building to manage. ▪ The issues cannot be easily addressed to make this facility fit for the future. 	<p>Explore voluntary organisation interest in managing the centre</p> <p>Keep operational as a Council facility until re-provided.</p>	<p>Consultation</p> <p>79% of survey responses supported the draft proposal.</p> <p>Main comments/concerns</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supportive of the proposal 2. Concern about voluntary sector capacity to manage centres 	<p>2. Process to explore interest will consider risks to organisations and appropriate support.</p>	<p>Explore options for a suitable alternative community space, keeping the centre operational in the meantime. Once alternative space is found options for leasing the pavilion to a voluntary organisation will be explored. If none are viable, then the pavilion could be used for sports use only.</p>
<p>499 15 37 Lawrence Way</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ King's Hedges and Arbury are high priority areas for the Council's services. ▪ The proposals seek to enhance provision, not reduce it. ▪ 37 Lawrence Way is a challenging building for delivering Council services ▪ The issues cannot be easily addressed to make this facility fit for the future. ▪ Tackling the city's housing crisis and implementing the Local Plan are corporate priorities for the Council. 	<p>Explore opportunities to re-provide as current provision is restrictive in terms of size, location and accessibility.</p>	<p>Consultation</p> <p>83.3% of survey responses supported the draft proposal.</p> <p>Main comments/concerns</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supportive of the proposal 2. Reduction in provision 	<p>2. Looking to reprovide more accessible community space.</p>	<p>Explore options for a suitable alternative community space, keeping the centre operational in the meantime. Once alternative community space is found the premises will be returned to Council housing stock.</p>

Review Evidence	Draft Proposal	Headline Findings	Response	Final Proposal
<p>5. Brown's Field Youth and Community Centre</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ East Chesterton remains a high priority area for the Council's services. ▪ The Council is committed to supporting Brown's Field as a core community centre in this location. 	<p>Retain as a Council managed community centre.</p>	<p>Consultation</p> <p>96.1% of survey responses supported the draft proposal.</p> <p>Comments made were supportive of the proposal.</p>	<p>Not required</p>	<p>Retain as a Council managed community centre, ensuring community access.</p>
<p>2016</p> <p>Ross Street Community Centre</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There are no areas of high need that cannot access dedicated community facilities. ▪ The proposal does not seek to reduce community provision in Romsey ward. ▪ It aims to retain a valued local community facility by offering an opportunity for voluntary sector management. 	<p>Explore voluntary organisation interest in managing the centre</p>	<p>Consultation</p> <p>67.9% of survey responses supported the draft proposal.</p> <p>Main comments/concerns:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reduction in provision 2. Concern about voluntary sector capacity to manage centres 3. Reduction in wider community access with faith based management 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Community access will remain. 2. Process to explore interest will consider risks to organisations and appropriate support. 3. A community access agreement will safeguard community use. 	<p>Seek to lease the centre to a voluntary organisation, with an agreement to safeguard community use. If a suitable organisation cannot be found the Council will retain management of the centre.</p>

7. Gaps identified Listed below	Listed below for each gap	Consultation 87.4% of survey responses supported the draft proposals.	Facilities in other areas will be considered via developer contributions	Listed below for each gap
---	---------------------------	---	--	---------------------------

Gap identified	Draft Proposal	Final proposal
a.) Abbey Ward High priority area	S106 investment in the County Council’s redevelopment of East Barnwell Community Centre.	Continue to support County Council led work on redevelopment of a new centre on the East Barnwell Community Centre site.
b.) Cherry Hinton Ward High priority area Page 17	Review existing assets with partners and the local community to improve community facility provision.	Support the development of a community hub in Cherry Hinton Library with local partners, with the proviso that the County Council continue library services there and a sustainable management solution is found.
c.) Queen Edith’s Ward High priority area north of ward	Explore opportunities with other facilities.	Explore opportunities to work with existing facility providers in the north of the ward
d.) East Chesterton Ward High priority area north of ward	Identify opportunities through development to provide additional community space.	Explore opportunities in the north of the ward for new facility provision through growth

8. The Vision	Consultation 72% of survey responses supported Draft Community Centres Strategy and Vision	The final proposals are detailed above and in the main report
----------------------	--	---

This page is intentionally left blank

1. Title of strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service:

Cambridge City Council Review of Community Provision and development of a Community Centres Strategy.

2. What is the objective or purpose of your strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service?

An EqIA for the Strategic Review of Community Provision was completed during Phase 1 (the Auditing phase), and Phase 2 (the analysis, planning and draft recommendations/strategy stage).

The EqIA has been updated to incorporate the Phase 3 work completed; the consultation and final recommendations/strategy stage.

Background

The purpose of the review is to develop a Vision that will ensure:-

- Council supported community centres are located in the right areas of the city to address the greatest needs
 - They are sustainable and provide accessible, joined up services to residents
 - They effectively contribute to the delivery of the Council's corporate priorities in a cost efficient way
 - The Council has successful partnership arrangements in place with the voluntary sector and other agencies, that meet the needs of local communities
- Council community development resource and activities are flexible to meet changing needs of the city

The datasets used to undertake the review include:

1. Community facility audit data;
2. Output data for low income households and benefit claimants;
3. Population density;
4. GIS 15 minute walk time¹ catchments

These datasets have helped to build a comprehensive evidence base to complete analysis work that will provide the Council with answers to the following questions:

1. What is the range of community facility provision currently in place across the city?
2. Are the Council's existing and planned community centres located in the right places to deliver the Council's community development activity and anti-poverty priorities?
3. If there are Council community centres which are not best located to deliver this work what should the future of these centres be?
4. Are there any gaps in current provision to be able to deliver the Council's anti-poverty priorities?
5. How could the Council look to address these gaps?
6. Following the analysis work, what is the future for centres identified as less strategically important and 'Transitional'?

Decision Making to Date

1. The Outcomes for the review were agreed at Community Services Scrutiny Committee on 14th January 2016 (click here to link to the report):

<http://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/documents/g2792/Public%20reports%20pack%2014th-Jan-2016%2014.30%20Community%20Services%20Scrutiny%20Committee.pdf?T=10>

2. The Development of a community centres strategy was agreed at Community Services Scrutiny Committee on 20th June 2016 (click here to link to the report):

<http://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/documents/g3076/Public%20reports%20pack%2030th-Jun-2016%2014.30%20Community%20Services%20Scrutiny%20Committee.pdf?T=10>

3. An EqIA was completed to inform a report to Community Services Scrutiny Committee on 19th January 2017, which provided details of the audit and analysis work completed and draft recommendations within a draft Community Centres Strategy. It was agreed to undertake a 12 week public consultation on the draft proposals and strategy (click here to link to the report):

<http://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=176&MId=3078&Ver=4>

4. The EqIA has now been updated to inform a report to Community Services Scrutiny Committee on 29th June 2017

• Who will be affected by this strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service?

Residents

Visitors

Staff

A specific client group or groups: Low income residents and other residents who use community centres, other statutory agencies and voluntary organisations

• What type of strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service is this?

New strategy

• Responsible directorate and service

Directorate: Community Services

Service: Community Services

• Are other departments or partners involved in delivering this strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service?

Housing Development Agency, Cambridge Investment Partnership, Corporate Strategy, GIS team, Planning team, Centre staff, Centre users, residents, residents associations, partner organisations e.g. County Council, voluntary organisations

• **Potential impact**

Please list and explain how this strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service could **positively** or **negatively** affect individuals from the following equalities groups. When answering this question, please think about:

- a. The results of relevant consultation that you or others have completed (for example with residents, people that work in or visit Cambridge, service users, staff or partner organisations).
- b. Complaints information.
- c. Performance information.
- d. Information about people using your service (for example whether people from certain equalities groups use the service more or less than others).
- e. Inspection results.
- f. Comparisons with other organisations.
- g. The implementation of your piece of work (don't just assess what you think the impact will be after you have completed your work, but also think about what steps you might have to take to make sure that the implementation of your work does not negatively impact on people from a particular equality group).
- h. The relevant premises involved.
- i. Your communications.

Performance Information

Quarterly key performance data is collected from Council community centres, on three of the protected characteristics (age, ethnicity and disability) as part of routine monitoring at each of the Council operated centres. Community centres which are managed by voluntary sector organisations under a Service Level Agreement arrangement are also required to submit performance monitoring data as a condition of grant funding. User survey data was also collected.

A detailed stakeholder analysis has been completed for each of the Council's community centres to enable the impact of individual recommendations to be assessed. Further work has also been completed to assess the capacity of community centres which serve the same catchment of residents.

Consultation Methodology

A 12 week public consultation to enable feedback on the draft proposals ran from the 13th February to 5th May 2017 and consisted of:

1. Online survey (344 received)
2. Drop-ins (28.5 hours of face to face public engagement)
3. Reports to all Area Committees (4)
4. Focus group work with equality groups (voluntary sector led)
5. Partner engagement
6. Group meetings on request

The consultation has enabled the Council to more fully assess the impact of the recommendations from the review on current community centre users; local residents; the voluntary sector and partner agencies.

Consultation Findings

Detailed consultation findings and a summary document are both available, and the key issues raised in relation to positive or negative impacts of the proposals on individuals are summarised below.

1. Buchan Street

The consultation findings support Proposal A (69% of responders) to explore interest from voluntary organisations in taking on management of the centre. The Council's final recommendation is to complete a full feasibility study to assess the viability of being able to deliver community supported aspirations for both:

- a.) a new community hub to replace the Meadows Community Centre and;
- b.) leasing Buchan Street Neighbourhood Centre to a voluntary sector organisation

The consultation raised the following impact issues in relation to Proposal B:

- The elderly and disabled users will have further to travel to access services if the Buchan Street centre is closed
- There is a lack of public transport options to get people to the alternative centre provision

2. The Meadows

The consultation supported the draft proposal (58% of responders) to build a new community hub to replace the Meadows Community Centre.

The consultation raised the following impact issues in relation to this proposal:

- The transition from the current building to a new hub must not cause any disruption to existing users of the centre
- Accessibility for disabled persons
- Loss of the sports hall
- Loss of the youth club
- Loss of the garden area for sensory impairments
- A need for groups and residents to input into the detailed design of a new hub to ensure specific needs and requirements are addressed

3. Nun's Way Pavilion and 37 Lawrence Way

The consultation supported the draft proposal (79% of responders for Nuns Way and 83% of responders for 37 Lawrence Way) to explore options for a suitable alternative community space. Keep operational with the existing management arrangement until re-provided, and then explore voluntary organisation interest managing Nuns Way Pavilion, and convert 37 Lawrence Way back into a Council house.

The consultation raised the following impact issues in relation to this proposal:

- The elderly and disabled users will have further to travel to access services if the location of the replacement provision is further away
- The current provision is out of date and badly designed and not a suitable venue because of accessibility issues

4. Brown's Field

The consultation supported the draft proposal (96% of responders) to retain as a Council managed community centre, ensuring community access in accordance with the community development approach and Council priorities.

The consultation raised the following impact issues in relation to this proposal:

- The centre is of high value to families, young people and children and provided vital, safe access to the outdoor/green space for children and young people.
- The signage was poor and that the centre can be very difficult to find
- It requires improved internal design, better wider general facilities and local publicity

5. Ross Street

The consultation supported the draft proposal (68% of responders) to pursue a voluntary organisation to lease the centre, with an agreement to safeguard community use. If a suitable organisation cannot be found, the Council will retain management of the centre.

The consultation raised the following impact issues in relation to this proposal:

- Concern that if it is managed by a faith organisation this could potentially impact on wider users
- Participants do not feel that the centre is accessible for people with Physical Disability and Sensory Impairments, and therefore do not access services from this centre

Subject to the outcome of detailed feasibility work, further detailed consultation with users and residents will be required as part of any planning application process.

National research (local information is not always available, particularly for some equalities groups, so use national research to provide evidence for your conclusions).

Prior to commencing the review, officers visited Oxford City Council who had completed a similar recent review of community centres provision. As part of this they had defined a 15 minute¹ accessibility standard for residents. The city shares a number of similarities with Cambridge so in defining the methodology for the review we adopted the same 15 minute¹ accessibility standard to complete the geographic and demographic assessment analysis work.

(a) Age (any group of people of a particular age, including younger and older people – in particular, please consider any safeguarding issues for children and vulnerable adults)

- Age profile performance data collected for each of the Council managed community centres highlights the following in terms of the age profile of community centre users:-
 1. Brownsfield – high level use for younger people and families
 2. Meadows and Buchan Street – high level use for older people and families
- The review analysis has identified gaps in access to community centres in four wards within the city (East Chesterton, Abbey, Cherry Hinton and Queen Edith's). The recommendations propose changes which will address these gaps in access to provision, and this will have a positive impact on improving access for all age within a 15 minute walk time (0.75 miles of their home).
- We will examine on a case by case basis the impact of the recommendations and decisions relating to individual centres.

(b) Disability (including people with a physical impairment, sensory impairment, learning disability, mental health problem or other condition which has an impact on their daily life)

- The data collected about disabilities as part of the key performance data is broad and encompassing. We are also aware that there are some disabilities which some people won't be happy to disclose e.g. mental health, so the data collected is generic.
- There are known accessibility issues at two existing Council centres:
 1. 37 Lawrence Way – a community house
 2. Nun's Way Pavilion – a sports pavilion with community rooms
 3. 82 Akeman Street – a converted shop
- The recommendations in the review will have a positive impact on addressing the accessibility issues for disabled users at these facilities
- We will examine on a case by case basis the impact of the recommendations and decisions relating to individual centres

(c) Gender

- We currently collect individual data on gender and classify community centre users based on interest.
- The review analysis has identified gaps in access to community centres in four wards within the city. The recommendations propose changes which will address the gaps and this will have a positive impact on improving access for both genders that currently do not have access to a centre within a 15 minute walk time (0.75 miles of their home).
- We will examine on a case by case basis the impact of the recommendations and decisions relating to individual centres.

(d) Pregnancy and maternity

- The centres currently provide activities for children, young people, families and activities.
- There is a particular focus for children and young people's activity at Brown's Field community centre, as this provides the base for the ChYpPs service (Children and young people's participation service), which runs activities all year round for children and families. The recommendations do not propose changes to Brown's Field but a review of community development activity may revise the focus of this activity across the city.
- The review analysis has identified gaps in access to community centres in four wards within the city. The recommendations propose changes which will address the gaps and this will have a positive impact on improving access for families and children who currently do not have access to a centre within a 15 minute walk time¹ (0.75 miles of their home).
- We will examine on a case by case basis the impact of the recommendations and decisions relating to individual centres.

(e) Transgender (including gender re-assignment)

- The Council does not currently collect individual data on transgender, but we do run high profile awareness events in partnership with voluntary organisations e.g. transgender awareness training, which helps to raise the profile as a safe space.
- We will examine on a case by case basis the impact of the recommendations and decisions relating to individual centres.

(f) Marriage and Civil Partnership

No data and no impact as far as we can tell, but this will be kept under review.

(g) Race or Ethnicity

- The breakdown of the % proportion of all visits based on ethnicity is limited, high level and is not based on individual usage basis, but rather on activity.
- The activities on offer at all Council community centres are inclusive, but 82 Akeman Street has a greater proportion of BME users which reflects its location in the city.
- The review analysis has identified gaps in access to community centres in four wards within the city. The recommendations propose changes which will address the gaps and this will have a positive impact on improving access for BME groups who currently do not have access to a centre within a 15 minute walk time¹ (0.75 miles of their home).
- We will examine on a case by case basis the impact of the recommendations and decisions relating to individual centres.

(h) Religion or Belief

- Brown's Field, Buchan Street and the Meadows all have regular bookings for faith organisations.
- We will examine on a case by case basis the impact of the recommendations and decisions relating to individual centres.

(i) Sexual Orientation

- No individual data is collected. Centres promote the 'Safer Spaces' campaign <http://encompassnetwork.org.uk/saferspaces>

- As part of developing the evidence base for the review, LGBT groups were consulted specifically and had shared the findings from their own needs assessment work. This assessment identified a need for a dedicated space for the LGBT community in the city.
- The Meadows has been used as a venue by the LGBT community. Throughout the review we have held a number of meetings with the LGBT community to consider need for a dedicated community venue and office space in the City.
- Following their needs assessment completed in summer 2016, they have now moved away from the view that they need a dedicated community space, because this often diverts resources from frontline service delivery and require specific asset management skills.
- We will look at opportunities to address the LGBT community's needs through partnership working at both Council venues and with other facility providers in the city.

(j) Other factors that may lead to inequality – please consider the impact of any changes on low income groups or those experiencing the impacts of poverty:

Low income households and benefit claimants provided geographic evidence of need across the city for the review. Generally, the areas of greatest need in the city are in the north and east.

• If you have any additional comments please add them here

This EqIA is a living document and this assessment will be updated on an on-going basis. An Action Plan has been completed in relation to the negative impacts identified.

• Conclusions and Next Steps

- j. If you have not identified any negative impacts, please sign off this form.**
- k. If you have identified potential negative actions, you must complete the action plan at the end of this document to set out how you propose to mitigate the impact. If you do not feel that the potential negative impact can be mitigated, you must complete to explain why that is the case.**
- l. If there is insufficient evidence to say whether or not there is likely to be a negative impact, please complete the action plan setting out what additional information you need to gather to complete the assessment.**

All completed Equality Impact Assessments must be emailed to Suzanne Goff, Strategy Officer, who will arrange for it to be published on the Council's website.
Email suzanne.goff@cambridge.gov.uk

• Sign off

Name and job title of assessment lead officer: Allison Conder

Names and job titles of other assessment team members and people consulted:
Jackie Hanson, Suzanne Goff, Debbie Kaye

Date of completion: 13th June 2017

- Date of next review of the assessment: In accordance with any development timetable**

Action Plan

Equality Impact Assessment - Review of Community Provision

Date of completion: 13th June 2017

Equality Group	Age
Details of possible disadvantage or negative impact	Elderly users will have further to travel to access services
Action to be taken to address the disadvantage or negative impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The review used 15 minute walk time¹ catchments to assess the impact on residents. Although some elderly residents will have further to travel to access services, they will still remain within a 15 minute walk time of the alternative provision i.e. the same accessibility as other elderly users within the same catchment ▪ Further assessment will be made to identify any particular individuals who cannot access the new community hub at the Meadows and if there is a valid reason they cannot, the Council will try to find a solution to enable access to continue.
Lead Officer	Jackie Hanson and Allison Conder
Date action to be completed by	In accordance with any development timetable
Equality Group	Disability
Details of possible disadvantage or negative impact	Disabled users will have further to travel to access services
Action to be taken to address the disadvantage or negative impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The review used 15 minute walk time¹ catchments to assess the impact on residents. Although some disabled residents will have further to travel to access services, they will still remain with a 15 minute walk time¹ of the alternative provision i.e. the same accessibility as other disabled users within the same catchment. ▪ Further assessment will be made to identify any particular individuals who cannot access the new community hub at the Meadows and if there is a valid reason they cannot, the Council will try to find a solution to enable access to continue.
Lead Officer	Jackie Hanson and Allison Conder
Date action to be completed by	In accordance with any development timetable

¹ Travel time of 3mph, covering 0.75 miles in 15 minutes Reference: <https://www.bhf.org.uk/get-involved/events/training-zone/walking-training-zone/walking-faqs>

Equality Group	Religion or Belief
Details of possible disadvantage or negative impact	Faith organisation management could potentially impact on wider community use
Action to be taken to address the disadvantage or negative impact	A community access agreement will safeguard community use.
Lead Officer	Jackie Hanson and Allison Conder
Date action to be completed by	In accordance with any development timetable
Equality Group	Gender
Disadvantage or negative impact	N/A at this stage
Equality Group	Pregnancy and Maternity
Disadvantage or negative impact	N/A at this stage
Equality Group	Transgender
Disadvantage or negative impact	N/A at this stage
Equality Group	Marriage and Civil Partnership
Disadvantage or negative impact	N/A at this stage
Equality Group	Race or Ethnicity
Disadvantage or negative impact	N/A at this stage
Equality Group	Sexual Orientation
Disadvantage or negative impact	N/A at this stage
Other factors that may lead to inequality	
Disadvantage or negative impact	N/A at this stage

This page is intentionally left blank



To: Councillor Richard Johnson Executive Councillor for Communities

Report by: Debbie Kaye

Relevant scrutiny committee: Community Services Scrutiny Committee 29/6/2017

Wards affected: Abbey Arbury Castle Cherry Hinton Coleridge East Chesterton King's Hedges Market Newnham Petersfield Queen Edith's Romsey Trumpington West Chesterton

REVIEW OF STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIPS: HEALTH AND WELLBEING BOARD AND CHILDRENS EXECUTIVE PARTNERSHIP

Not a Key Decision

1. Executive summary

1.1 A report giving an update on the key external partnerships the Council is involved with was provided to Strategy and Resources Scrutiny Committee on 20 March 2017. It was agreed at this meeting that Community Services Scrutiny Committee be given the opportunity to consider the partnerships relevant to its work – Cambridgeshire's Health and Wellbeing and the Children's Trust - and to also take into account how growing concerns about homelessness in the City are presently feeding into these partnerships.

2. Recommendations

2.1 The Executive Councillor is recommended to:

- a) Continue to work with these key external partnerships to ensure that public agencies and others can together address the strategic issues affecting Cambridge, including the growing homelessness issue in the City, and that the concerns of Cambridge citizens are responded to.

3. Background

3.1 The annual report on the strategic partnerships the Council is involved with is provided on an annual basis and is part of a commitment given in the Council's "Principles of Partnership Working". In some cases members may be aware of current issues arising from a partnership as a result of recent reports about their activities that have arisen a key decisions need to be taken.

3.2 It is a time where the partnership landscape is rapidly changing due in part to Government reforms, the impact of public spending restrictions or new opportunities that may have arisen through devolution or other collaborative working arrangements to help tackle the "big issues" for Cambridge and Cambridgeshire.

3.3 The partnerships considered in this report are:

- **Cambridgeshire's Trust**
- **Cambridgeshire's Health and Wellbeing Board**

4. Cambridgeshire Children's Trust

4.1 The Children's Trust Executive Partnership is a small body consisting of five members, the Lead Member for Children's Services (Cambs County Council), the Executive Director for Children, Families and Adult Services and the three chairs of the Area Partnerships, that sits at the centre of a network aimed at supporting partnership working and facilitating local activities that are delivered to children, young people and their families.

4.2 The Executive Partnership has taken on the lead role for reporting annually on progress towards Priority 1 of the county Health and Wellbeing Strategy, "Ensure a positive start to life for children, young people and their families". Its latest report was submitted to the Health and Wellbeing Board on 19 January 2017.

4.3 The priorities for the Children's Trust (2014-17) were developed from the views of partners in the Executive Board and its Area Partnerships. These are to:

- Address the impact of welfare reforms and poverty on educational attainment and health outcomes of children
- Improve children's mental health and considering parental mental health

- Address drug and alcohol misuse within the family environment
- 4.4 The Children’s Trust Executive Group meets twice a year and it is expected that the bulk of its work is carried out by the Area Partnerships whose members come together to address local needs and develop actions that add value to the work of any one organisation. All of the three partnerships, East Cambridgeshire and Fenland, South Cambridgeshire and Cambridge City and, Huntingdonshire have a track record of developing projects on small or zero budgets, testing new ideas and approaches.
- 4.5 Cambridge City Council does not have a representative in the Children’s Trust Executive Partnership, instead working through the Local Area Partnership (South Cambridgeshire and Cambridge City).
- 4.6 The role of **Children’s Trust Area Partnerships** is to:
- Develop partnership work that enhances opportunities for children, young people and their families living within that area
 - Develop and support key projects to be delivered locally
 - Monitor progress and provide an annual report on progress and gaps to the Executive Partnership
 - Escalate issues and barriers for resolution
 - Highlight local trends and gaps within existing service provisions
 - Facilitate networking and collaborative working within a local context
- 4.7 Each Local Area Partnership has developed its own local plan. This plan identifies local activities that are delivered collectively with local partners to meet the needs of families. This is an officer group and the Council’s Children’s and Young People’s Services Manager is involved in its work. The Council has a duty under Children’s Act 2004 to work in partnership with other statutory organisations to achieve positive outcomes for children.
- 4.8 The key work strands for the South Cambridgeshire and Cambridge City Local Area Partnership in 2016/17 includes:
- The “Heads Up” project that provided early mental health support in schools for 4 – 11 year old children. From the initial sessions staff were able to identify those who needed additional support
 - Assisting the Together for Families project to offer the “Think Family” approach to other organisations, particularly those in the community and voluntary sector

- As part of the Accelerating Achievement programme the partnership is working with the Collaborative Outreach Network to develop local projects with young people to raise aspirations, especially for vulnerable groups
- Working with Arts and Minds to offer “Arts on Prescription” project to two local schools in Cambridge
- Supporting the roll-out of the “Tough Love” project in secondary schools and community settings.

4.9 A phase one consultation document was published in December 2016 as part of the county’s **Children’s Change Programme**. It outlined how the county council’s children and young people’s services could be delivered in a different way, integrating the Social Care and Enhanced and Preventative Services into a single management structure. This involved bringing together specialists and locality teams into a single district team under one manager. This may help reduce some duplication and make the service a bit sharper but could involve the loss of senior posts to achieve savings at a time when demand for services seems to be increasing and the gap in levels of achievement between pupils in receipt of pupil premium and other groups is deteriorating.

4.10 It is not clear in what format **Children’s Centres** or the **Together for Families** initiative will emerge from the change programme. It seems that the Local Area Partnerships will remain in place although the coordinator post will be moved into a different county council directorate and the hours assigned to it reduced by one day – so the level of officer support available to the locality partnerships will be reduced.

4.11 A response document to the concerns raised during the consultation was published at the end of January 2017. The Area Partnerships will have further opportunities to give their views about proposed arrangements for the delivery of children and young people’s services in their localities as they are developed.

4.12 At present there are no young homeless people recorded in Cambridge but around 50 young do live in temporary accommodation with their families. The Area Partnerships will be carrying out a strategic assessment of issues in their areas shortly and the issue of homelessness will be considered as a part of this assessment.

5. **Cambridgeshire’s Health and Wellbeing Board (HWB)**

5.1 Cambridgeshire’s Health and Wellbeing Board (“the Board”) and its network brings together leaders from local organisations that have a

strong influence on health and wellbeing, including the commissioning of health, social care and public health services, to help plan services for Cambridgeshire that will secure the best possible health and wellbeing outcomes for all residents.

- 5.2 The Board includes representatives from, county council, local district councils, public health, education, NHS England, Clinical Commissioning Group, Healthwatch and others. The Council's representative in the Board is Councillor Abbott.
- 5.3 During the past year representation from NHS organisations was increased within the Board to give it a better balance between local authorities and the NHS. There was concern that the committee was taking on a scrutiny role, which is the domain of the county **Health Committee**, rather than an advisory role. The Board meets bi-monthly. The Council's representative in the Health Committee is Councillor Abbott.
- 5.4 The work of the Board is guided by the **Cambridgeshire Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2012-17**. The strategy focuses on six priorities to improve the physical and mental health and wellbeing of Cambridgeshire residents. In particular, there is an intention to improve the health of the poorest fastest. One of the areas of focus within the strategy is to **“Work with local partners to prevent and tackle homelessness and address the effects of changes in housing and welfare benefits on vulnerable groups”**.
- 5.5 The **Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA)** informs and underpins the Health and Wellbeing Strategy and provides a series of assessments about the needs of people in Cambridgeshire. Recently a New Housing Developments and Built Environment JSNA and Drug and Alcohol JSNA have been published. There is a Homelessness and At Risk of Homelessness JSNA prepared in 2010 that describes the needs of people who are homeless or at risk of becoming homeless, that Council officers helped contribute to. Progress in improving the health and wellbeing of local populations is assessed in the Director of Public Health's Annual Report.
- 5.6 The **Annual Public Health Report (APHR)** for 2015/16 adds a broader focus, looking at changes and trends in public health outcomes over recent years. The APHR 2016/17 report highlights sources of information about Local Health (a tool provided by Public Health England) and supports three opportunities for public health

action in Cambridgeshire, building on the priorities of the previous report. These are:

- A focus on promoting the health of school age children, including mental health
- A whole system approach to healthy diet and physical activity – reversing the trend in obesity
- Supporting a positive approach to healthy ageing.

5.7 The national **Public Health Outcomes Framework** (PHOF) provides detailed information on how well Cambridgeshire is doing compared with other areas for a range of health outcomes, as well as the lifestyle and environmental factors which influence health. The current Cambridge Local Health Profile is for 2015 and shows some of the PHOF headlines for the City. It states that, “The health of people in Cambridge is generally better than the England average. Deprivation is lower than average, however about 14.9% (2,500) children live in poverty. The inequality in life expectancy (*between wards*) that is related to deprivation in this local area is 8.2 years for men and 7.9 years for women”.

5.8 This year the work of the Cambridgeshire Health and Wellbeing Board has been heavily influenced by the emergence of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough’s five year **Sustainability and Transformation Plan (STP)**, which was published on 21 November 2016 by the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group.

5.9 This plan helps address issues highlighted in its Evidence for Change document (March 2016) and develops a response to an interim STP summary (July 2016) that forecast a deficit for the local health care system of £250m in addition to the £250m of savings and efficiency plans individual Trusts and the Clinical Commissioning Group need to deliver. The scale of the change required is significant and it is recognised that its delivery will be challenging.

5.10 The STP sets out how a successful local NHS health care economy can be delivered in its “Fit for the Future” programme. This includes new locality and system-wide governance. At the same time the county council through its **Transforming Lives** strategy is looking to develop a new approach to social care and deliver the requirements of

the Care Act, its Older People's Programme and the Better Care Fund.

- 5.11 Partners in the local health and care system are looking to work together to find solutions to the challenges they are facing and are trying to align healthcare, public health and social care. The integration of local health and social care is likely to be a future part of the delivery of a phase of the **Devolution Agreement**.
- 5.12 To assist the different NHS organisations in working closer together a **Memorandum of Understanding (MoU)** setting out behaviours and principles that will promote joint working has been agreed between them. A variant that takes into account local authority governance has now been signed by Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City unitary authority. It is expected that district councils will be asked to sign-up to a statement supporting principles of joint working to help promote healthy living, to allow further preventative work to take place with NHS partners. This statement is presently being prepared.
- 5.13 The Health and Wellbeing Board is seen as the partnership body where partnership working is promoted and this has been the place where the Fit for the Future programme has been discussed with district councils. The Board has also considered some of the governance arrangements for the STP, including the establishment of Area Boards to allow local NHS organisations to discuss their plans for services with local partners and to try to bolster preventative care to reduce demand for acute services.
- 5.14 The CCG is keen to align the Area Boards with communities of place and have proposed a Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire Area Board as one of three Area Boards covering Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. Local Health Partnerships could be incorporated into Area Boards, although no detailed proposals have been developed.
- 5.15 Whilst the number of health and social care forums has reduced overall with the restructuring of NHS and county services the council is still faced with deciding where it can best influence partners, promote our contribution to improving wellbeing and ensure the best outcomes for local people. The council presently has an officer representative in the Area Board and Healthy Ageing and Prevention Steering Group.

- 5.16 A **Public Health Reference Group** presently reports to the Health and Wellbeing Board and involves district public health leads in developing approaches to public health that support the Director of Public Health's priorities of mental health (particularly for children), promoting physical activity and reducing the isolation of older people. These priorities coincide with priorities for the council and so there are opportunities for the Council to contribute and to look to align some of our current work. Recently the council's sports development team were involved in a successful project, supported by funding from public health, to promote physical activity across Cambridgeshire.
- 5.17 The county Public Health service is presently looking to work closer with district councils and is preparing a district council and public health delivery plan to build on what is being done locally and to provide additional support from its specialist advisors where it is needed. Recent business of the Board has included looking at the CCG's Mental Health Strategy Framework, Primary Care Strategy – GP Recruitment and Retention, Pharmaceutical Needs Assessment and Better Care Fund Planning.
- 5.18 The **Cambridge Local Health Partnership** (CLHP), which forms a part of the Board's network, involves local GPs and others with an interest in local health and social care. It is chaired by the City Council's Executive member for Communities. The main role of the CLHP is to inform the Executive member and the member representing the council in the Board about local health and social care issues, so that the interests of Cambridge's residents can be taken into account by the HWB Board, and to promote local partnership working.
- 5.19 Recently the CLHP has been using a themed approach to its meetings, looking at each of the priorities of the HWB strategy in turn, taking the theme that will be on the agenda of the following HWB Board meeting. The CLHP usually meets a week before the HWB Board but on a quarterly basis. The HWB Board meets on alternative months – six times a year – so there are meetings where the CLHP won't be able to consider HWB Board agenda.
- 5.20 The CLHP has looked in the past at supported housing and partnership responses to reduce street based homelessness. The Council has put in place a Homelessness Strategy Action Plan that sets out what the Council and its partners want to achieve in this area,

which includes help tackle rough sleeping and its root causes. A “Homelessness Summit” was convened where partners committed to agreed actions, giving clear expectations for partners and a joint monitoring system performance and outcomes to help understand what works and to achieve value for money. This approach is summed up in the joint “Rough Sleeping Statement”.

- 5.21 With funding secured through the government’s Homelessness Prevention Trailblazer fund, the council will be further working with partners to build on and develop the co-ordinated multi-agency approach to preventing homelessness. This will include: training for professionals; setting up a landlord resolution service to help maintain tenancies and reduce evictions; improving access to private rented housing; and improving web-based information on the range of services available.

6. Implications

(a) Financial Implications

The strategic partnerships the Council is involved with have resources to improve infrastructure and support the growth of Cambridge. By working together with other public agencies the Council may be able to achieve more than working on its own.

(b) Staffing Implications (if not covered in Consultations Section)

This will depend on how the development of joint working opportunities is taken forward within each partnership.

(c) Equality and Poverty Implications

The partnerships will identify ways of involving all communities in their work, including those who are more disadvantaged. Emphasis will be on providing affordable housing, training and other measures to move people back into work and addressing health inequalities.

(d) Environmental Implications

Business models that promote low carbon use and improve the sustainability of developments will be supported.

(e) Procurement

The partnerships are likely to procure or commission services to achieve their aims.

(f) Consultation and communication

Individual bidding streams and plans will specify the groups of people to be consulted, especially where targeted work is required.

(g) **Community Safety**

To improve community safety is a core purpose of the Cambridge Community Safety Partnership, which was considered as part of the report provided to Strategy and Resources on 20 March, 2017.

7. Background papers

Background papers can be accessed by following the hyperlinks set out beneath the document headings:

Cambridge City Council's Homelessness Strategy Action Plan

<https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/content/housing-and-related-strategies#homelessness-strategy>

Principles of Partnership Working

<https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/content/guide-partnership-working>

Cambridgeshire's Health and Wellbeing Board

http://www4.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/info/20004/health_and_keeping_well/548/cambridgeshire_health_and_wellbeing_board

Joint Strategic Needs Assessment

<http://www.cambridgeshireinsight.org.uk/jsna>

Annual Public Health Report

<http://cambridgeshireinsight.org.uk/health/aphr>

Cambridge Local Health Profile 2015

<http://fingertipsreports.phe.org.uk/health-profiles/2016/e07000008.pdf>

Cambridge Local Health Partnership

<http://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/mgCommitteeDetails.aspx?ID=347>

Children's Trust and Area Partnerships

http://www4.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/info/20076/children_and_families_practitioners_and_providers_information/279/children_and_families_working_with_partners/2

8. Appendices

No Appendices have been added.

9. Inspection of papers

To inspect the background papers or if you have a query on the report please contact:

Author's Name: Graham Saint
Author's Phone Number: 01223 - 457044
Author's Email: graham.saint@cambridge.gov.uk